

In re Application of: Moshe MALIK et al
 Serial No.: 10/599,385
 Filed: August 9, 2007
 Office Action Mailing Date: January 19, 2010

Examiner: McGraw, Trevor Edwin
 Group Art Unit: 3752
 Attorney Docket: 37705
 Confirmation No.: 7857

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above identified application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested. This Response is in response to the Office Action dated January 19, 2010. In the Office Action:

Office Action Summary, Disposition of Claims is stated as follows:

- > Claims 1 – 57 are pending in the application.
- > Claims 1 – 6, 9 – 11, 14 – 18, 23 – 40 and 42 – 57 are rejected.
- > Claims 7, 8, 12, 13, 19 – 22, and 41 are objected to.

DETAILED ACTION is itemized as follows:

Claims 1 – 6, 9, 10, 14 – 18, 23, 24, 35, 36, 38 – 40, 42 – 45, and 47 – 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Wacker et al (US 5,938,079).

Claims 54 – 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Brown (US 5,242,115).

Claims 25 – 30, 33, 34 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Wacker et al (US 5,938,079).

Claims 7, 8, 12, 13, 19 – 22, and 41 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but appear to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Summary of the Disposition of the Claims via Applicant's Response

Claims 1 - 57 remain as originally filed.

New claim 58 is added.

In re Application of: Moshe MALIK et al
Serial No.: 10/599,385
Filed: August 9, 2007
Office Action Mailing Date: January 19, 2010

Examiner: McGraw, Trevor Edwin
Group Art Unit: 3752
Attorney Docket: 37705
Confirmation No.: 7857

Highlights of the Claims Amendments

New dependent claim 58 depending from independent claim 43 was added for specifying and defining, and therefore, claiming, originally disclosed subject matter, particularly with respect to additional functional features of the chemical mixing device.

The new claims were added by strictly relying upon the originally filed specification of the patent application. Words, phrases, and terms used for amending the claims, and for adding new claims, were directly obtained from, and, literally (textually) and illustratively (figuratively) supported by, the text and figures of the specification of the originally disclosed invention. Accordingly, no new subject matter appears in the amended claims or in the new claims.

The Examiner is respectfully made aware that the US Patent Application Publication, Malik, et al., having Pub. No.: US 2008/0035673 A1, and Pub. Date: Feb. 14, 2008, of the present U.S. Pat. Appl. No. 10/599,385 used for preparing the present Amendment. Accordingly, Applicant's references to page and paragraph numbers correspond to those of the just stated publication of the present patent application document.

Details of Applicants Response

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 102(b) Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1 – 6, 9, 10, 14 – 18, 23, 24, 35, 36, 38 – 40, 42 – 45, and 47 – 53 as being anticipated by Wacker et al (US 5,938,079).

In re Application of: Moshe MALIK et al
Serial No.: 10/599,385
Filed: August 9, 2007
Office Action Mailing Date: January 19, 2010

Examiner: McGraw, Trevor Edwin
Group Art Unit: 3752
Attorney Docket: 37705
Confirmation No.: 7857

Regarding Independent Claim 1:

In page 2 of the Examiner's Office Action, the Examiner states:

"In regards to Claim 1, Wacker et al teach a chemical mixing device (30) having a flow generator (20,21) operative to provide at least two streams of chemicals (chemical of 12 and 13) and a mixing chamber (83, 89; see Figure below), including at least two inlets (58a, 58c) adapted to receive the at least two streams of chemical (see column 5 lines 36 -41) and an outlet (outlet of 96) through which a mixture of the streams of chemicals is ejected from the mixing device (30), wherein the mixing chamber (83, 89; see Figure below) has an open state (see open state of 83, 89; in Figure 7) in which the chemicals are mixed and a closed state (see closed state of 83, 89; in Figures 8 and 9) in which the volume of the mixing chamber (83, 89; see Figure below) is less than a fifth of the open state volume.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner regarding the lack of novelty in claim 1 of the present application as anticipated by the teachings of Wacker.

Wacker specifically teaches an "open state" and a "closed state" in the valves and not in the mixing chamber. Additionally, Wacker teaches an enlarged mixing chamber 83. Furthermore, Wacker nowhere teaches a reduction in the volume of the mixing chamber when in a closed state nor a reduction in the volume of the mixing chamber to less than a fifth of the open state volume. The volume reduction occurs in each valve assembly (the chemicals are not mixed in the valves).

In re Application of: Moshe MALIK et al
Serial No.: 10/599,385
Filed: August 9, 2007
Office Action Mailing Date: January 19, 2010

Examiner: McGraw, Trevor Edwin
Group Art Unit: 3752
Attorney Docket: 37705
Confirmation No.: 7857

Reference is made to Wacker et al, column 6, lines 1 – 5; " The supply valve assembly 58a is pneumatically operated **"zero cavity" valve**, comprising a body assembly formed of a main body portion 64a and a secondary body portion 65a which is attached to the main body portion 64a by means of suitable fasteners such as screws 66a."

Furthermore, in column 6, lines 23 – 33 Wacker discloses; "... With "zero cavity" valve design, the valve head formed by the needle valve member 69a is at the maximum position downstream so that there is no cavity of residual material downstream in the supply chamber prior to entering the mixing chamber. **When the needle valve member 69a is retracted away from the valve seat, the flow of component material from the supply chamber 68a into the mixing chamber 53 is enabled. When the needle valve member 69a rests on the valve seat, the flow of component material from the supply chamber 68a into the mixing chamber 53 is cut off.**"

As can be appreciated from the above, Wacker teaches an "open state" and a "closed state" in the valves (58a, 58c), and a mixing chamber (83) which receives the two mixing components from a first mixing chamber 53 into which the two components are first introduced. During the valve "open state", the (pneumatically driven) needle valve member (69a) is retrieved from the valve seat, allowing for flow of the components from the pumps (20, 21) through the valve into the first chamber (53), and into mixing chamber (83). During the valve "closed state", the needle valve member (69a) is pushed to rest on the valve seat (by a spring action), so that there is no flow from the pumps (20, 21) through the valve into the mixing chamber (53), and subsequently into the mixing chamber (83). **No reduction in volume occurs in any of the mixing chambers (53, 83).**

In re Application of: Moshe MALIK et al
Serial No.: 10/599,385
Filed: August 9, 2007
Office Action Mailing Date: January 19, 2010

Examiner: McGraw, Trevor Edwin
Group Art Unit: 3752
Attorney Docket: 37705
Confirmation No.: 7857

In contrast with Wacker's teachings, Malik et al teach moving the mixing chamber into an open state or a closed state. Reference is made to Malik et al, page 1, paragraphs [0014] – [0016].

Therefore, based on the above explanation, the Applicant respectfully reiterates his disagreeing with the Examiner regarding the lack of novelty in claim 1 of the present application as anticipated by the teachings of Wacker.

Regarding Independent Claim 35:

In page 4 of the Examiner's Office Action, the Examiner states:

"In regard to Claim 35, Wacker et al teach a chemical mixing device (30) having a flow generator (20, 21) operative to provide at least two streams of chemicals (chemical of 12 and 13), and a mixing chamber (83, 89; see Figure below), including at least two inlets (58a, 58c) adapted to receive the at least two streams of chemicals (see column 5, lines 36 – 41) and an outlet (outlet of 96) through which a mixture of the streams of chemicals is ejected wherein the mixing chamber (83, 89; see Figure below) is formed of a flexible material (see flexible material 98)."

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner regarding the lack of novelty in claim 35 of the present application as anticipated by the teachings of Wacker.

In re Application of: Moshe MALIK et al
Serial No.: 10/599,385
Filed: August 9, 2007
Office Action Mailing Date: January 19, 2010

Examiner: McGraw, Trevor Edwin
Group Art Unit: 3752
Attorney Docket: 37705
Confirmation No.: 7857

Wacker specifically teaches a use of two mixing chambers, a mixing chamber 53 and an enlarged mixing chamber 83, with no mention of their comprising a flexible material. Wacker's use of a flexible material 98 is as a flexible tube included as part of a flow shut off assembly for preventing dripping or dribbling when the flow of the foam is cutoff in the dispenser. t. Wacker specifically distinguishes between the mixing chambers and the flow shut off assembly as being separate assemblies.

Reference is made to Wacker et al, column 7, lines 18 - 32; "At the bottom of the extension 84, **the mixing chamber 83 tapers to a dispensing channel 89**, as shown in more detail in FIGS 7, 8, and 9. After the components have been thoroughly mixed together in the mixing chamber 83, the channel 89 is designed as a relatively straight channel without convolutions or corners which could collect undesirable accumulations of foam material which would be difficult to clean during operation of the purging system. **Below the dispensing channel is a flow shutoff assembly 92** which prevents residual portions of the mixed components from dripping or dribbling from the head when the supply valve assemblies have been closed. **The flow shutoff assembly 92 comprises a housing 94** which is positioned at the bottom of the extension 84."

Furthermore, Wacker discloses in column 7, lines 40 -42; "**An inner flexible tube 98 is provided within the housing 94 surrounding and defining the flow channel.**"

Additionally, Wacker discloses in column 3, lines 6 – 20; "To prevent the undesired dribble or drip of residual foam product, the mixing and dispensing head of this invention also includes a **flow shutoff assembly located at the extreme downstream end of the head where the foamed material exits the head**. The flow shutoff assembly provides for a positive shut off of the foamed material from the mixing and dispensing head, so that **the residual material does not drip onto the**

In re Application of: Moshe MALIK et al
Serial No.: 10/599,385
Filed: August 9, 2007
Office Action Mailing Date: January 19, 2010

Examiner: McGraw, Trevor Edwin
Group Art Unit: 3752
Attorney Docket: 37705
Confirmation No.: 7857

substrate after the component supply valves have been closed. The flow shutoff assembly operates automatically, so that manual pinching or closing of the dispensing channel is avoided.....”

In contrast with Wacker's teachings, Malik teaches using a flexible material to form a chemical leading unit which includes the mixing chamber. Reference is made to Malik et al, page 5, paragraph [0071] and [0072].

Therefore, based on the above explanation, the Applicant respectfully reiterates his disagreeing with the Examiner regarding the lack of novelty in claim 35 of the present application as anticipated by the teachings of Wacker.

Regarding Independent Claim 40:

In page 5 of the Examiner's Office Action, the Examiner states:

"In regard to claim 40, Wacker et al teach a flow generator (20, 21, 24) operative to provide at least two streams of chemicals and a mixing chamber (53, 83, 89) including at least two inlets (inlets of 58a and 58c) adapted to receive the at least two streams of chemicals and an outlet (outlet of 96) through which a mixture of the streams of chemicals is ejected and a flow regulator (valve rods of 58a and 58c) are capable of preventing flow into the mixing chamber unless the chemical streams from the flow generator (20, 21, 24) have a pressure above a threshold of at least 2 bar."

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner regarding the lack of novelty in claim 40 of the present application as anticipated by the teachings of Wacker.

In re Application of: Moshe MALIK et al
Serial No.: 10/599,385
Filed: August 9, 2007
Office Action Mailing Date: January 19, 2010

Examiner: McGraw, Trevor Edwin
Group Art Unit: 3752
Attorney Docket: 37705
Confirmation No.: 7857

Wacker does not teach the flow regulator preventing flow into the mixing channel unless the chemical streams from the flow generator have a pressure above threshold of at least 2 bar. Wacker specifically teaches controlling flow into the mixing chamber by pneumatically moving a needle valve member in the valve so that component flow into mixing chamber 53 from the valve is enabled or disabled.

Reference is made to Wacker et al, column 6, lines 12 – 48; "The component material from the supply hose enters the body 64a through the port and enters into a supply chamber 68a formed within the body 64a. The supply chamber 68a is connected to the mixing chamber 53 within the main body 42, and a valve seat is provided between the supply chamber 68a and the mixing chamber 53. A needle valve member 69a is guided by a guide member 70a mounted in the downstream portion of the chamber 68a. The needle valve member 69a extends through the chamber 68a and engages the valve seat to control the flow of component material from the supply chamber 68a into the mixing chamber 53. With "zero cavity" valve design, the valve head formed by the needle valve member 69a is at the maximum position downstream so that there is no cavity of residual material downstream in the supply chamber prior to entering the mixing chamber. When the needle valve member 69a is retracted away from the valve seat, the flow of component material from the supply chamber 68a into the mixing chamber 53 is enabled. When the needle valve member 69a rests on the valve seat, the flow of component material from the supply chamber 68a into the mixing chamber 53 is cut off. The needle valve member 69a is actuated through a pneumatic chamber 71a formed within the body 64a. Air in the pneumatic chamber 71a operates against a piston 72a connected to the end of the needle valve member 69a to open the valve. The valve is urged into the closed position by a spring 73a which pushes against the piston 72a on the opposite side from the pneumatic chamber

In re Application of: Moshe MALIK et al
Serial No.: 10/599,385
Filed: August 9, 2007
Office Action Mailing Date: January 19, 2010

Examiner: McGraw, Trevor Edwin
Group Art Unit: 3752
Attorney Docket: 37705
Confirmation No.: 7857

71a. The spring 73a is retained within a cap 74a attached to the end of the body 64a by suitable fasteners such as bolts 75a. The maximum open position of the valve is adjusted by means of an adjusting knob 76a which is mounted on the end of an adjusting rod 77a. A nut member 78a is mounted on the end of the cap 74a, and makes a threaded connection with the adjusting rod 77a. The axial position of the adjusting rod 77a is changed by turning the knob 76a to move the adjusting rod relative to the nut member 78a.

Therefore, based on the above explanation, the Applicant respectfully reiterates his disagreeing with the Examiner regarding the lack of novelty in claim 40 of the present application as anticipated by the teachings of Wacker.

Regarding Independent Claim 43:

In page 5 of the Examiner's Office Action, the Examiner states:

"In regard to claim 43, Wacker et al teach a chemical mixing device (30) having a flow generator (20, 21, 24) operative to provide at least two streams of chemicals and a mixing chamber (53, 83, 89) including at least two inlets (inlets of 58a and 58c) adapted to receive the at least two streams of chemicals and an outlet (outlet of 96) through which a mixture of the streams of chemicals is ejected and at least two channels (see channels 58a and 58c that lead to 53) having a decreasing cross section area, adapted to lead the chemical streams to the inlets of the mixing chamber (83, 89; see Figure below).

In re Application of: Moshe MALIK et al
Serial No.: 10/599,385
Filed: August 9, 2007
Office Action Mailing Date: January 19, 2010

Examiner: McGraw, Trevor Edwin
Group Art Unit: 3752
Attorney Docket: 37705
Confirmation No.: 7857

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner regarding the lack of novelty in claim 40 of the present application as anticipated by the teachings of Wacker.

Wacker teaches use of a relatively straight channel (dispensing channel 89) attached to mixing chamber 83 as an outlet of the chamber and not an inlet.

Reference is made to Wacker et al, column 7, lines 18 – 26; "At the bottom of the extension 84, the mixing chamber 83 tapers to a dispensing channel 89, as shown in more detail in FIGS. 7, 8 and 9. After the components have been thoroughly mixed together in the mixing chamber 83, the components enter the dispensing channel 89. The dispensing channel 89 is designed as a relatively straight channel without convolutions or corners which could collect undesirable accumulations of foam material which would be difficult to clean during operation of the purging system.

Therefore, based on the above explanation, the Applicant respectfully reiterates his disagreeing with the Examiner regarding the lack of novelty in claim 43 of the present application as anticipated by the teachings of Wacker.

Regarding Independent Claim 47:

In page 6 of the Examiner's Office Action, the Examiner states:

"In regard to claim 47, Wacker et al teach a foam dispensing device (30) comprising a plurality of input tubes (22, 23, 28, 29) adapted to receive chemicals, a mixing chamber (83, 89; see Figure below) having at least one elastic wall (98) and a flow generator (20, 21, 24) adapted to induce flow of the chemicals received from the

In re Application of: Moshe MALIK et al
Serial No.: 10/599,385
Filed: August 9, 2007
Office Action Mailing Date: January 19, 2010

Examiner: McGraw, Trevor Edwin
Group Art Unit: 3752
Attorney Docket: 37705
Confirmation No.: 7857

input tubes (22, 23, 28, 29) into the mixing chamber (53, 83, 89; see Figure below), wherein the mixing chamber (53, 83, 89; see Figure below) has a first volume when the flow generator (20, 21, 24) is not operating, and a second, larger volume when the flow generator (20, 21, 24) induces flow of the chemicals into the mixing chamber (53, 83; see volume when the valves 58a and 58c that permit chemical to enter 53 are closed is fixed and when the valves open the volume of the chamber is larger due to the valve members not being disposed in 53 in Figure 2).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner regarding the lack of novelty in claim 47 of the present application as anticipated by the teachings of Wacker. The responses previously provided by the Applicant for independent claims 1, 35, 40, and 43, are equally applicable herein.

The Examiner is respectfully referred to the responses provided for independent claims 1, 35, 40, and 43.

Therefore, based on the above explanation, the Applicant respectfully reiterates his disagreeing with the Examiner regarding the lack of novelty in claim 47 of the present application as anticipated by the teachings of Wacker.

Regarding Independent Claims 54:

In page 8 of the Examiner's Office Action, the Examiner states:

“In regard to Claim 54, Brown teaches a kit for replacement of a mixing chamber of a dispensing gun having a package (10), a mixing chamber (100) within the package (10), and a flow generator (28) connected to the mixing chamber (100) within the package (10).”

In re Application of: Moshe MALIK et al
Serial No.: 10/599,385
Filed: August 9, 2007
Office Action Mailing Date: January 19, 2010

Examiner: McGraw, Trevor Edwin
Group Art Unit: 3752
Attorney Docket: 37705
Confirmation No.: 7857

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner regarding the lack of novelty in claim 54 of the present application as anticipated by the teachings of Brown.

Brown teaches a dispensing device wherein a nozzle including a mixing chamber is removable and may be disposable. Brown does not teach a flow generator being removable (and disposable). Brown teaches that the flow generator is separated from the mixing chamber which connects to individual component feed systems (which include the trigger mechanism).

Reference is made to Brown, column 3, lines 30 – 35; “Still another object of the invention is to provide a novel mixing and dispensing **nozzle which is removable and may be disposable**, and which is designed to control the introduction of each component into the mixing chamber thereof....”

In column 5, lines 30 – 47; “Fitted within and extending from the mixing head 12 is a mixing and dispensing nozzle 16 which includes at least one mixing chamber 18. **The nozzle 16 and mixing chamber 18 may also be formed by molding techniques, such that the entire assembly is easily and cost-effectively manufactured.** The mixing chamber 18 **communicates with individual component feed systems having internal passages 20 and a valve means 22** for each component to be mixed in the system. The internal passages 20 also communicate with a plurality of inlet ports 24 which may be coupled to a source of a liquid component under pressure such as by hoses 26 or alternatively by portable pressurized aerosol cylinders or the like. **The valve means 22 is actuated by means of a trigger member 28 to allow flow of the liquid components within the internal passages 20 and to mixing chamber 18 to be dispensed through dispensing nozzle 16.**”

In re Application of: Moshe MALIK et al
Serial No.: 10/599,385
Filed: August 9, 2007
Office Action Mailing Date: January 19, 2010

Examiner: McGraw, Trevor Edwin
Group Art Unit: 3752
Attorney Docket: 37705
Confirmation No.: 7857

Therefore, based on the above explanation, the Applicant respectfully reiterates his disagreeing with the Examiner regarding the lack of novelty in claim 54 of the present application as anticipated by the teachings of Brown.

Regarding Independent Claim 57:

In page 8 of the Examiner's Office Action, the Examiner states:

“In regard to Claim 57, Brown further teaches a kit for replacement of a mixing chamber (100) of a dispensing gun (see Gun in Figure 1) comprising a package (10), a nozzle (16) defining a mixing chamber (100) within the package (10) and at least one chemical container connected to the nozzle (16) within the package (10; see column 5, lines 38 – 43).”

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner regarding the lack of novelty in claim 57 of the present application as anticipated by the teachings of Brown.

Brown specifically teaches the dispensing device being externally connected to a hose or a pressurized container (chemical container), the chemical components flowing through the gun into the mixing chamber. Wacker does not teach the use of a container for a single chemical inside the gun.

Reference is made to Brown, column 5, lines 38 – 43, as cited by the Examiner; “The internal passages 20 also **communicate with a plurality of inlet ports 24 which may be coupled to a source of a liquid component under pressure**

In re Application of: Moshe MALIK et al
Serial No.: 10/599,385
Filed: August 9, 2007
Office Action Mailing Date: January 19, 2010

Examiner: McGraw, Trevor Edwin
Group Art Unit: 3752
Attorney Docket: 37705
Confirmation No.: 7857

such as by hoses 26 or alternatively by portable pressurized aerosol cylinders or the like.”

Reference is also made to Brown, column 5, lines 35 – 38; “The mixing chamber 18 **communicates with individual component feed systems having internal passages 20 and a valve means 22** for each component to be mixed in the system.”

Therefore, based on the above explanation, the Applicant respectfully reiterates his disagreeing with the Examiner regarding the lack of novelty in claim 57 of the present application as anticipated by the teachings of Brown.

Regarding the dependent Claims 2 - 6, 9, 10, 14 – 18, 23, 24, 36, 38, 39, 42, 44 – 46, 48 – 53, 55 and 56:

- a. Claims 2 - 6, 9, 10, 14 – 18, 23 and 24 are dependent on independent claim 1.
- b. Claims 36, 38, and 39 are dependent on independent claim 35.
- c. Claim 42 is dependent on independent claim 40.
- d. Claim 44 – 46 are dependent on independent claim 43.
- e. Claim 48 – 53 are dependent on independent claim 47.
- f. Claim 55 and 56 are dependent on independent claim 54.

Therefore, based on the above explanations, the Applicant respectfully requests from the Examiner to overturn the rejection of Claims 1 – 6, 9, 10, 14 – 18, 23, 24, 35, 36, 38 – 40, 42 – 45, 47 – 53, 54 – 56, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

In re Application of: Moshe MALIK et al
Serial No.: 10/599,385
Filed: August 9, 2007
Office Action Mailing Date: January 19, 2010

Examiner: McGraw, Trevor Edwin
Group Art Unit: 3752
Attorney Docket: 37705
Confirmation No.: 7857

The Applicant respectfully call the Examiner's attention to dependent claims 2, 3 and 5 which contain novel features of the claimed invention not included in the cited prior art.

In claim 2, the mixing chamber has a substantially zero volume whereas in the cited prior art, the mixing chambers have a substantially non-zero volume. Referring to Wacker et al, column 5, lines 27 – 32; "The mixing shaft 52 rotates within a mixing chamber 53 formed at the lower end of the central opening in the main body 42." **The inclusion of shaft 52 in mixing chamber 53 prevents the mixing chamber from having a substantially zero volume.** In column 7, lines 4 – 17, Wacker states; "Below the mixing chamber 53 is an enlarged mixing chamber 83 formed within a tubular extension 84 mounted on the lower portion of the main body 42. Within the extension 84 is a cylindrical mixing core 85 having an array of indentations and outwardly extending angled vanes 86. The mixing core 85 is mounted to the lower end of the mixing shaft 52, and the core rotates within the enlarged mixing chamber 83 as the mixing shaft turns. As the cylindrical mixing core 85 rotates, the vanes 86 create turbulence which mixes the components supplied from the supply valve assemblies 58 until the components are thoroughly mixed together to create the chemical reaction which produces the foam which is then ready to be dispensed from the mixing and dispensing head 30." **The inclusion of mixing core 85 in mixing chamber 83 prevents the mixing chamber from having a substantially zero volume.**

In claim 3, the mixing chamber has walls that are biased in a closed state in which the walls are pressed against each other. **The inclusion of shaft 52 in mixing chamber 53 and the mixing core 85 in mixing chamber 83 prevents the walls of the mixing chambers from pressing against one another.**

In re Application of: Moshe MALIK et al
Serial No.: 10/599,385
Filed: August 9, 2007
Office Action Mailing Date: January 19, 2010

Examiner: McGraw, Trevor Edwin
Group Art Unit: 3752
Attorney Docket: 37705
Confirmation No.: 7857

In claim 5, the mixing chamber has a volume smaller than a cubic millimeter in the closed state. **The inclusion of shaft 52 in mixing chamber 53 and the mixing core 85 in mixing chamber 83 prevents the the mixing chambers from having a volume smaller than a cubic millimeter.**

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 25 – 30, 33, 34, and 36 as being unpatentable over Wacker et al (US 5,938,079).

Regarding Independent Claim 25:

In page 9 of the Examiner's Office Action, the Examiner states:

“In regard to Claims 25, 26 and 34, Wacker et al as described above substantially teach the present invention with the exception of where the volume of the mixing chamber from a first mixing point of the streams to the outlet is not greater than 20 cubic millimeters and the length of the mixing chamber from the inlets to the outlet is not longer than 15 millimeters and the mixing chamber has an average cross section area of les than 10 square millimeters. It would have been obvious matter of design choice to make the volume of the mixing chamber from a first mixing point of the streams to the outlet is not greater than 20 cubic millimeters and the length of the mixing chamber from the inlets to the outlet is not longer than 15 millimeters and the mixing chamber has an average cross section area of less than 10 square millimeters, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. Furthermore, the general conditions of a claim are met by the

In re Application of: Moshe MALIK et al
Serial No.: 10/599,385
Filed: August 9, 2007
Office Action Mailing Date: January 19, 2010

Examiner: McGraw, Trevor Edwin
Group Art Unit: 3752
Attorney Docket: 37705
Confirmation No.: 7857

prior art, and a person having ordinary skill would recognize that making a component smaller, bigger, longer or shorter does not involve innovation but requires only common sense for smaller or larger application.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner regarding the lack of patentability of claim 25 of the present application under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The Applicant's response above to the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 1, section B therein, show that the claimed invention meets the requirement of 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Claim 25 includes a same novel feature of claim 1, "a flow generator operative to provide at least two streams of chemicals".

Regarding the dependent Claims 26 - 30, 33, 34, and 46:

- a. Claims 26 - 30, 33, and 34 are dependent on independent claim 25.
- b. Claim 46 is dependent on independent claim 43.

Therefore, based on the above explanation, the Applicant respectfully requests from the Examiner to overturn the rejection of Claims 25 – 30, 33, 34 and 46, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner states the Claims 7, 8, 12, 13, 19 – 22, and 41 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but appear to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In re Application of: Moshe MALIK et al
Serial No.: 10/599,385
Filed: August 9, 2007
Office Action Mailing Date: January 19, 2010

Examiner: McGraw, Trevor Edwin
Group Art Unit: 3752
Attorney Docket: 37705
Confirmation No.: 7857

A. The Applicant's response above to the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 1 shows that the claimed invention meets the requirement of 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Claims 7, 8, 12, 13 and 19 -22 are dependent on independent claim 1.

B. The Applicant's response above to the Examiner's rejection of independent claim 41 shows that the claimed invention meets the requirement of 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Claim 41 is dependent on independent claim 40.

Therefore, based on the above explanation, the Applicant respectfully requests from the Examiner to allow Claims 7, 8, 12, 13, 19 – 22, and 41.

Regarding new claim 58:

New dependent claim 58 depending from independent claim 43 was added for specifying and defining, and therefore, claiming, originally disclosed subject matter, particularly with respect to additional structural and functional features of the chemical mixing device.

Support for the dependent claim 58 may be found in page 7, paragraph [0096] of the present application:

“Mixing chamber **280** optionally has in its open position a volume of at least 3 cubic millimeters or even at least 5 cubic millimeters, so as to provide sufficient room for mixing of the chemicals.”

In re Application of: Moshe MALIK et al
Serial No.: 10/599,385
Filed: August 9, 2007
Office Action Mailing Date: January 19, 2010

Examiner: McGraw, Trevor Edwin
Group Art Unit: 3752
Attorney Docket: 37705
Confirmation No.: 7857

Therefore, based on the above explanation, the Applicant respectfully requests from the Examiner to allow the addition of new dependent claim 58.

Thus, Applicant submits that the above discussion completely addresses and overcomes Examiner 35 U.S.C. 102(b) claim rejections regarding Claims 1 – 6, 9, 10, 14 – 18, 23, 24, 35, 36, 38 – 40, 42 – 45, 47 – 53, and 54 – 57; Examiner's 35 U.S.C. 103(a) claim rejections regarding 25 – 30, 33, 34 and 46; Examiner's objections regarding Claims 7, 8, 12, 13, 19 – 22, and 41; and that the claims are in allowable condition together with new claim 58, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jason H. Rosenblum/

Jason H. Rosenblum
Registration No. 56,437
Telephone: 718.246.8482

Date: May 18, 2010

Enclosures:

- Petition for Extension (One Months)
- Additional Claims Transmittal Fee